

-11-

REMARKS

The Examiner has objected to the claims. Such objection is deemed overcome in view of the clarifications made hereinabove to the claims.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-6, 10-15, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wallenius (USPN 6,760,417). Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection, especially in view of the amendments made hereinabove. Specifically, the subject matter of Claim 6 et al. has been incorporated into each of the independent claims.

In the latest action, the Examiner has relied on the following excerpt to make a prior art showing of the following subject matter of former Claim 6 (now incorporated into each of the related independent claims) "wherein the customer is charged for the customer communication by mapping the Internet Protocol content usage information to the call description record information."

"it thus receives the CDR data coming from the support nodes 11 and 12 and filtered by the CGF. Also in this case the mediator unit 14 converts in real time the information it receives by applying the charging algorithms of the network to provide unambiguous charging data, expressed as an amount of money spent or as charging pulses, for example." (see col. 5, lines 31-37)

Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion. The foregoing excerpt, along with the remainder of the Wallenius reference, simply makes absolutely no mention of any sort of mapping of the Internet Protocol content usage information to the call description record information, for the specific purpose of charging customers.

The Examiner is reminded that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F.2d 628,

-12-

631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.* 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim.

This criterion has simply not been met by the Wallenius reference, as noted above. Nevertheless, despite these paramount differences and in the spirit of expediting the prosecution of the present application, applicant has amended each of the independent claims to include the following or similar subject matter:

“wherein the customer is charged for the customer communication by mapping the Internet Protocol content usage information to the call description record information to generate mapped information that is filtered, enhanced, and aggregated prior to being delivered to a billing module” (emphasis added).

Thus, only applicant teaches and claims the specific mapping of Internet Protocol content usage information to the call description record information for the specific purpose of generating mapped information that is filtered, enhanced, and aggregated prior to being delivered to a billing module. A notice of allowance or a specific prior art showing of each of the foregoing limitations, along with the remaining claim elements, is respectfully requested.

Applicant further draws the Examiner's attention to the following new claims which are presented for full consideration:

29. (New) The method as recited in claim 1, wherein the Internet Protocol usage information is mapped to the call description record information to generate a modified call description record.
30. (New) The method as recited in claim 1, wherein the mapping includes collecting source and destination Internet Protocol addresses, application

-13-

information, an amount of sent and received data, start and end timestamps, and effective quality of service.

31. (New) The method as recited in claim 1, wherein the mapping includes storing a table in memory that is used to associate dynamic IP flow with international mobile station identity (IMSI), and cellular and quality of service information.
32. (New) The method as recited in claim 1, wherein the Internet Protocol content usage information and the call description record information are mapped to a lightweight directory access protocol (LDAP) database and aggregated with an aggregator, resulting in contract records.
33. (New) The method as recited in claim 1, wherein information collected through NetFlow and remote traffic monitoring (RMON) web processes is further enhanced by a global system for mobile communication (GPRS) associator.
34. (New) The method as recited in claim 1, wherein the mapping further includes synchronization between distributed associators.
35. (New) The method as recited in claim 1, wherein the mapping provides competitive content-based tariff models.
36. (New) The method as recited in claim 20, wherein the access is altered by selectively precluding access to a particular network based on whether the IP address resides within a predetermined address group.
37. (New) The method as recited in claim 20, wherein the prioritization includes prioritization of packet flows based on an IP address source and destination so that a mobile communication unit assigned a higher priority

-14-

receives faster service by being serviced before mobile communication units with a lower priority.

Yet again, a notice of allowance or a specific prior art showing of each of the foregoing limitations, along with the remaining claim elements, is respectfully requested.

To this end, each of the independent claims are hereby deemed allowable along with any claims depending therefrom. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 505-5100. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be due or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. XACTP004).

¹¹
Respectfully submitted,

Kevin J. Zilka
Registration No. 41,429

P.O. Box 721120
San Jose, CA 95172-1120
408-505-5100